

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 10-25, 27, 29-35, 37-42, 46, 47-53, and 55-59 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 24, and 52 being independent. Applicant cancels claims 6-9 and 32 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter. Applicant amends claims 1 and 24 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at page 4, lines 14-25. Therefore, claims 1-5, 10-25, 27, 29-31, and 33-35, 37-42, 46, 47-53, and 55-59 are presented and directed to subject matter of the original disclosure.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 A., B., C., D., AND E.**

**A. Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 12-24, 27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-41, 52-53 and 55-59 stand rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,064,980 to Jacobi, in view of U.S. Application No. 2004/0068536 to Demers, and in further view of U.S. Application No. 2002/0054158 to Asami.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent claim 1. Amended claim 1 now recites a computer-implemented interactive media frame display system comprising the following computer executable components (emphasis added):

a host component comprising at least one host media store;

a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely browse and selectively view a plurality of media items in a display cycle, the

plurality of media items comprise digital picture or video and are stored in the at least one host media store, *the media frame component comprising:*

*an annotation component that annotates one or more media items with one or more media items with one or more metadata, the metadata comprising at least one of intrinsic metadata comprising at least user behavior and extrinsic metadata comprising at least generic training data, the annotation component comprising:*

*a metadata generation component comprising an analyzing component that identifies properties respectively associated with the media items; and*

a communication connection between the media frame component and the host component, the communication connection enabling the media frame display to:

retrieve a plurality of media items from the host media store,

store them in a local store,

arrange a subset of the media items in a display cycle,

perform edit operations to a metadata of at least one of the media items, and

transmit back to the host media store the at least one of modified metadata, and/or the display cycle of the subset of the media items, wherein the local data store is operably connected to the interactive media frame display.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is disclosed, taught or suggested by Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami, alone or in combination.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, Applicant amends independent claim 1 to clarify the subject matter. Claim 1 recites “*a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely browse and selectively view a plurality of media items in a display cycle, the plurality of media items comprise digital picture or video and are stored in the at least one host media store, the media frame component comprising: an annotation component that annotates one or more*

*media items with one or more media items with one or more metadata, the metadata comprising at least one of intrinsic metadata comprising at least user behavior and extrinsic metadata comprising at least generic training data, the annotation component comprising: a metadata generation component comprising an analyzing component that identifies properties respectively associated with the media items.”* Applicant respectfully submits that Jacobi does not disclose, teach or suggest these features of amended claim 1. Rather, Jacobi describes a recommendation service that uses collaborative filtering techniques to recommend books to users of a web site. *See*, Jacobi, Abstract. The system offers the user a database of titles that have been previously rated and also allows the user to browse the site to read about the various titles contained within the catalog. *See*, Jacobi, Col. 4, lines 42-46. The system of Jacobi allows the user to only view and manipulate a catalog listing of the media item. *See*, Col. 2, lines 46-50.

Applicant respectfully submits that Demers fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Jacobi. Rather, Demers describes a multimedia software application that can combine the multimedia experience with the transfer of information between a variety of sources, in a variety of directions and subject to a variety of prompts. *See*, Demers, Abstract. Therefore, Demers fails to describe at least “*a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely browse and selectively view a plurality of media items in a display cycle, the plurality of media items comprise digital picture or video and are stored in the at least one host media store, the media frame component comprising: an annotation component that annotates one or more media items with one or more media items with one or more metadata, the metadata comprising at least one of intrinsic metadata comprising at least user behavior and*

*extrinsic metadata comprising at least generic training data, the annotation component comprising: a metadata generation component comprising an analyzing component that identifies properties respectively associated with the media items,” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 1.*

Applicant respectfully submits that Asami fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Jacobi and Demers. Rather, Asami describes an information-processing apparatus and a computer-graphic display program that are capable of displaying abundant expressions. *See, Asami, paragraph [0006].* The cyclical time concepts in Asami are based on predetermined regularities including nature and creatures along with integrated pictures and integrated comments wherein 1 cycle typically comprises a sequence of transitions among the four seasons, namely, the spring, the summer, the autumn and the winter, the lapse of time on a day from a morning through a day time to a night or temperature or humidity repetitions. *See, Asami, paragraph [0006].*

Thus, Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejection made under § 103 and respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 2, 5, 10, 12-23** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and thus are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests individual consideration of these dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

## **Independent Claim 24**

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent claim 24. Amended claim 24 now recites a computer-implemented method of browsing, viewing, and/or manipulating one or more media items from a remote interactive media frame display comprising (emphasis added):

retrieving one or more media items from at least one host location;

displaying the one or more media items on the interactive media frame, wherein the media items comprise digital picture or video;

receiving a user input that includes a request to browse or view the one or more media items in a display cycle;

performing one or more acts on the one or more media items based at least in part upon the user input;

annotating the one or more media items with one or more metadata;

viewing the one or more favorite media items on the display for enjoyment, wherein viewing one or more favorite media items on the display comprises performing at least one of the following:

*designating a percentage of media items having common metadata from the retrieved media items as the favorite media items for viewing;*

*designating the display cycle to cyclically display the favorite media items in connection with at least one of an amount of viewable time per media item or a length of time one or more media items are available for viewing on the display;*

ordering the one or more media items into an alternate display cycle based at least in part upon any one of metadata and user preferences;

removing/adding the one or more media items from/to the display cycle;

storing the one or more media items in a local data store operably connected to the interactive media frame display; and

transmitting back to the host media store the at least one of annotations to the media items and the altered display cycle of the media items.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed, taught or suggested by Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami, alone or in combination.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, Applicant amends independent claim 24 to clarify the subject matter. Claim 24 recites “*designating a percentage of media items having common metadata from the retrieved media items as the favorite media items for viewing; designating the display cycle to cyclically display the favorite media items in connection with at least one of an amount of viewable time per media item or a length of time one or more media items are available for viewing on the display.*” Applicant respectfully submits that Jacobi does not disclose, teach or suggest these features of independent claim 24. Rather, Jacobi describes a recommendation service that uses collaborative filtering techniques to recommend books to users of a web site. *See*, Jacobi, Abstract. The system offers the user a database of titles that have been previously rated and also allows the user to browse the site to read about the various titles contained within the catalog. *See*, Jacobi, Col. 4, lines 42-46. The system of Jacobi allows the user to only view and manipulate a catalog listing of the media item. *See*, Col. 2, lines 46-50. Therefore, Jacobi fails to describe the features of amended claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Demers fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Jacobi. Rather, Demers describes a multimedia software application that can combine the multimedia experience with the transfer of information between a variety of sources, in a variety of directions and subject to a variety of prompts. *See*,

Demers, Abstract. Therefore, Demers fails to describe at least “*designating a percentage of media items having common metadata from the retrieved media items as the favorite media items for viewing; designating the display cycle to cyclically display the favorite media items in connection with at least one of an amount of viewable time per media item or a length of time one or more media items are available for viewing on the display,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 24.

Applicant respectfully submits that Asami fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Jacobi and Demers. Rather, Asami describes an information-processing apparatus and a computer-graphic display program that are capable of displaying abundant expressions. *See*, Asami, paragraph [0006]. The cyclical time concepts in Asami are based on predetermined regularities including nature and creatures along with integrated pictures and integrated comments wherein 1 cycle typically comprises a sequence of transitions among the four seasons, namely, the spring, the summer, the autumn and the winter, the lapse of time on a day from a morning through a day time to a night or temperature or humidity repetitions. *See*, Asami, paragraph [0006].

Thus, Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejection made under § 103 and respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 27, 29-31, 33-35, and 37-41** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 24 and thus are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests individual

consideration of these dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

### **Independent Claim 52**

Independent claim 52 recites a computer-implemented interactive media frame display system comprising the following components (emphasis added):

a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely browse, manipulate, and view a plurality media items in a display cycle wherein a user *designates one or more of a percentage of related media items to display in a single cycle or a time of display for each media item within the display cycle or a period for which each media item is displayed in the display cycle;*

a communication component that connects the media frame component to at least a remote host media store such that it facilitates retrieval of the one or more media items from the remote host media store by the media frame component and transmission of at least one media item modified at the media frame back to the remote host media store;

a local store operably connected to the media frame component for storing the one or more media items retrieved from the remote host media store and the at least one of modified media items or operations performed on the media items.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is disclosed, taught or suggested by Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami, alone or in combination.

In making out the rejection of this claim the Office acknowledges that both Jacobi and Demers fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “a plurality media items in a display cycle wherein a user designates one or more percentage of related media items to display in a single cycle or a time of display for each media item within the display cycles or a period for which each media items is displayed in the display cycle.” *See*, Office Action, page



14. However, the Office states that Asami teaches accessing a favorite scheduled media comprises performing at least designating the access cycle to cyclically accessing in connection with at least one an amount of viewable time per media item, citing paragraph [0015]. *See*, Office Action, page 14. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, Asami describes an information-processing apparatus and a computer-graphic display program that are capable of displaying abundant expressions. *See*, Asami, paragraph [0006]. The cyclical time concepts in Asami are based on predetermined regularities including nature and creatures along with integrated pictures and integrated comments wherein 1 cycle typically comprises a sequence of transitions among the four seasons, namely, the spring, the summer, the autumn and the winter, the lapse of time on a day from a morning through a day time to a night or temperature or humidity repetitions. *See*, Asami, paragraph [0006].

Thus, Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejection made under § 103 and respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**Dependent claims 53 and 55-59** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 52 and thus are allowably by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant respectfully requests individual consideration of these dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 3, 11, and 25 stand rejected as being obvious over Jacobi, in view of Demers, in view of Asami, and in further view of U.S. Application No. 2006/0178946 to Agarwal.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that all the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness have not been met by the Office. The § 103 rejection of **dependent claims 3, 11, and 25** rely on Jacobi, Demers, and Asami as the primary, secondary, and tertiary references, respectively. As explained above with respect to independent claims 1 and 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 24. Dependent claims 3, 11, and 25 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 24, respectively, and therefore include all of the features of their respective base claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that Agarwal fails to remedy the deficiencies of Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami. The Office cites Agarwal for its alleged teaching of “*the host locations being arranged in a wireless network configuration with the media component,*” as recited in Applicant’s claims 3 and 25, as well as “the analyzing component comprising a pattern recognition component,” as recited in Applicant’s claim 11. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, Agarwal relates to a system for creating gift clusters of multiple items in a client/server environment and for ordering of such user defined gift clusters of multiple items. *See*, Agarwal, Abstract. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Agarwal fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, “*an annotation component that annotates one or more media items with one or more media items with one or more metadata, the metadata comprising at least one of intrinsic metadata comprising at least user behavior and extrinsic metadata comprising at least generic*

*training data, the annotation component comprising: a metadata generation component comprising an analyzing component that identifies properties respectively associated with the media items,” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 1. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Agarwal fails to disclose, teach, or suggest or “designating a percentage of media items having common metadata from the retrieved media items as the favorite media items for viewing; designating the display cycle to cyclically display the favorite media items in connection with at least one of an amount of viewable time per media item or a length of time one or more media items are available for viewing on the display,” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 24.*

Thus, Jacobi, Demers, Asami, and/or Agarwal, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest those features recited in Applicant’s dependent claims 3, 11, and 25. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejection made under § 103 and thus Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**C. Claims 42, 46, and 47 stand rejected as being obvious over Jacobi, in view of Demers, in view of Asami, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,196 to Kronz.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that all the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness have not been met by the Office. The § 103 rejection of **dependent claims 42, 46, and 47** rely on Jacobi, Demers, and Asami as the primary, secondary, and tertiary references, respectively. Dependent claims 42, 46, and 47 depend from independent claim 24, and therefore include all of the features of that base claim. As explained above

with respect to independent claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 24.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kronz fails to remedy the deficiencies of Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami. Rather, Kronz relates to a method and apparatus for enabling any of a variety of devices to communicate with each other over a common or universal protocol. *See*, Kronz, Abstract. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kronz fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, “*designating a percentage of media items having common metadata from the retrieved media items as the favorite media items for viewing; designating the display cycle to cyclically display the favorite media items in connection with at least one of an amount of viewable time per media item or a length of time one or more media items are available for viewing on the display,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 24.

Thus, Jacobi, Demers, Asami, and/or Kronz, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest those features recited in Applicant’s dependent claims 42, 46, and 47. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejection made under § 103 and thus Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

**D. Claims 48-51 stand rejected as being obvious over Jacobi, in view of Demers, in view of Asami, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,719 to Bendinelli.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant submits that all the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness have not been met by the Office. The § 103 rejection of **dependent claims**

**48-51** rely on Jacobi, Demers, and Asami as the primary, secondary, and tertiary references, respectively. Dependent claims 48-51 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 24, respectively, and therefore include all of the features of their respective base claim. As explained above with respect to independent claims 1 and 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 24.

Applicant respectfully submits that Bendinelli fails to remedy the deficiencies of Jacobi, Demers, and/or Asami. Rather, Bendinelli describes techniques for integrating television and computer systems, and more particularly to techniques for presenting World Wide Web content or other computer network information to viewers in conjunction with television programming. *See, Bendinelli, Abstract.* The invention utilizes URLs or other network information identifiers transmitted with television signals in order to permit web content to be displayed in synchronization with related television programming. *See, Bendinelli, Abstract.* Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Bendinelli fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, *“an annotation component that annotates one or more media items with one or more media items with one or more metadata, the metadata comprising at least one of intrinsic metadata comprising at least user behavior and extrinsic metadata comprising at least generic training data, the annotation component comprising: a metadata generation component comprising an analyzing component that identifies properties respectively associated with the media items,”* as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 1. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Bendinelli fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *“designating a percentage of media items having common metadata from the retrieved media items as the favorite media items for*

*viewing; designating the display cycle to cyclically display the favorite media items in connection with at least one of an amount of viewable time per media item or a length of time one or more media items are available for viewing on the display,” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 24.*

Thus, Jacobi, Demers, Asami, and/or Bendinelli, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest those features recited in Applicant’s dependent claims 48-51. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office does not support the rejection made under § 103 and thus Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

Claims 1-5, 10-25, 27, 29-31, and 33-35, 37-42, 46, 47-53, and 55-59 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Date: July 6, 2009

By: /Kristina M. Kuhnert/  
Kristina Kuhnert  
Reg. No. 62,665  
509.324.9256 ext. 217

Shirley Lee Anderson  
Reg. No. 57,763